

# COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Ledger.  
The Free-School System of So. Ca.

NUMBER II.

We propose, now to examine the Justice, Equality, and Policy of the present mode of distribution of the Free School Fund.

As before stated in the first number, the Fund appropriated for Free School purposes is distributed under the present system among the several Parishes and Districts in the State, according to Representation in the House of Representatives. The appropriation and mode of distribution is regulated under an act of the Legislature, passed in 1811, and entitled "an act to establish Free Schools throughout the State." Under this act it is provided, "That immediately after the passing of this act, there shall be established in each Election District within this State, a number of Free Schools equal to the number of members which such District is entitled to send to the House of Representatives in the Legislature of this State," and also "that for the support and maintenance of the said Free Schools, the sum of Three Hundred Dollars per annum for each (member) is hereby and forever appropriated to be paid out of the Treasury of this State, in the manner hereinafter directed, until other sufficient funds may, by law, be provided."

The House of Representatives is composed of one hundred and twenty-four members; and the constitution of the State prescribes the principle upon which the apportionment of members is to be made.

Under the 2d Section of the amendments of the constitution, ratified Dec. 17, 1893, it is thus expressed: "The House of Representatives shall consist of one hundred and twenty-four members; to be apportioned among the several election Districts of the State, according to the number of white inhabitants contained, and the amount of all taxes raised by the Legislature, whether direct or indirect, or of whatever species, paid in each," &c.

And in section 4th of the same, "In assigning representatives to the several districts this State, the Legislature shall allow one representative for every sixty-second part of the whole number of white inhabitants in the State; and one representative also for every sixty-second part of the whole taxes raised by the Legislature of the State," &c.

And under the 6th section, "If in the apportionment of representatives under these amendments, any election District shall appear not to be entitled from its population, and its taxes to a representative, such election District shall nevertheless send one representative," &c.

From which it is observed that representation in the House of Representatives is based upon Taxation as well as Population, and that, when there is not a sufficient amount of taxation, and a sufficient population, to entitle an Election District to a member, still it shall have one. A member in the House of Representatives derives his power, partly from taxation, and partly from population, and it may be, Ex Gratia—in the absence of both taxation and population, as a constitutional basis.

To distribute then, the fund according to representation in the House of Representatives, would be to distribute the same according to taxation and population among the election Districts. Taxation and population being the basis of such representation.

This in effect would make taxation as well as population the occasion of the necessity for the Fund, and the application of it depend upon these; when in fact, the want of Education among the people of the State originates the necessity for the appropriation. To show the unreasonableness of this principle, we must notice the relation in which taxation and population stand to Education. First, then, we remark, the people only as they stand in need of education, become the subjects and beneficiaries of the Fund, and in no other sense are they to be considered in connection with it. The same may be said of the several Districts and Parishes. But, in no sense, whatever, can taxable property be considered the subject or beneficiary of the Free School Fund. It was clearly the intention of the Legislature in voting the appropriation, to meet, if possible, the wants of Education in the several Districts and Parishes in the State, having regard simply to the Educational wants of each or of the whole State. To effect this end, it was necessary to resort to Taxation, in order to furnish the means. Hence it is, that Taxation stands to Education in the relation of means to an end. This, indeed, is the only relation which it sustains to education. The object of the Fund is Education, and the fund itself is but the means of attaining that object; what more has taxation to do with Education? Will any one say it forms one of the subjects of Education? If taxable property is to be educated, then the present mode of distribution is right! This is an age of new things, but we have yet to learn this fact.

Under any true system of Free Schools the Education of the people forms the object, the people are the subjects, and the fund the means of attaining the object, and reaching the subjects. From the insufficiency of the Fund, under the present system, to educate the whole people, it becomes limited to the poor indigent.

Such a mode of distribution of the Free School Fund, as will legitimately effect its object and purposes, is alone correct; any other is founded in error, and misapplies the Fund.

The present mode of distribution misapplies the Fund, because it is not made to depend upon and to follow strictly the subjects of the Fund the people, but also makes Taxation necessary for its application. This is inconsistent with the fitness of things, or the adaptation of the means to the end. It thus stands imperfectly the object, and reaches partially the subjects; and hence it is an unwise legislation and unwise in its policy.

It also discriminates between the Parishes and Districts and on that account it is unequal and unjust. It gives to the more wealthy Parishes and Districts, where there is always to be found a fewer number of white persons, a much larger share of the Free School Fund in proportion to their white population; and to the poorer Parishes and Districts, where there is always a larger white population a less share in proportion to their white population.

And in this place, we remark, that this discrimination does not extend to the Districts and Parishes as opposite interests; it applies as well to a Parish when compared with a Parish, as when compared with a District; and to a District compared with a District or Parish. The principle is the same, which entitles a Parish or District to a member in the House of Representatives, (Taxation and population). The inequality among the several Parishes and Districts results, not from the principle of Representation itself in the House of Representatives, (for that principle is the same in all), but because Representation is used as the basis of distribution, when, at the same time, it depends upon two principles (Taxation and Population), which vary, equally, in Parish or District, as one or the other of these principles predominates. The Parish of St. Helena with a white population of 1,078 is entitled to receive no more than St. Andrews with a white population of only 379.

The present mode of distribution of the Free School Fund is supposed by many to have some connection with the peculiarity of Representation in the Legislature, under the constitution of the State; and in that way it is viewed as an "up country," or "low country" measure, and the amount of Taxes of the upper or lower division, is introduced to have its weight in settling the question. But such is most certainly a mistake. The difference in the principle of Representation affecting the up country and low country, is found in the Senate alone, there each election District (Parish as well as District) is entitled, under the Constitution, to one member except the Parish of St. Philips and St. Michael's, which is entitled to two. The apportionment of members in the Senate, has nothing at all to do with the distribution of the Fund. The distribution depends upon Representation in the House of Representatives, and not in the Senate.

It likewise discriminates between the citizens of the State, who are the subjects of the Fund, and interested in its benefits; and it is thus partial in its character.

The subjects of the Fund are the people of the State; and they are benefited or injured, by the distribution in their several relations; either as individuals, the recipients of the Fund; or as Tax payers and citizens if the State residing in the different Parishes and Districts.

It operates partially upon the indigent, the recipients of the Fund, in this, that those who happen to live in a Parish or District, where Taxation contributes more or less to membership in the House, receive more or less from that circumstance. Where taxation predominates in entitling an election District to membership, there, a fewer number of indigent persons are to be found; and the consequence is, that this class of persons is either fully provided for, or it is extended and made to embrace within it, those who in other Parishes and Districts, where population predominates would be either, but partially provided for or altogether excluded. In this feature the present distribution is unequal, if not unjust.

It operates partially upon the Tax paying citizens of the State. They are interested in the fund, not only in its general object and purposes, but as a means of effecting the education of their neighbors, and thus contributing to their social advantage. As citizens of the State, and Tax payers, they are entitled to a more equitable distribution. The present mode of distribution disappoints them not only in its failure to accomplish the general purpose of the Fund as an auxiliary to the general diffusion of education, but in this, that it does not contribute, alike, to the enjoyment of the social advantages, which result from education upon their neighborhoods. And besides if the argument be good, that as Tax payers they are entitled to the full benefit of their taxes, it fails in this respect, and produces moreover an inequality, which is unjust. To illustrate this latter view: A. lives in one of the Parishes or Districts, and pays in taxes to the State, One Hundred Dollars; B. lives in another Parish or District and pays the same tax. B's Parish or District receives perhaps, double as much of the Free School Fund as A's. Is A. and B., both of whom are equal as Tax payers, affected alike? Does it not produce an inequality? If the principle be a just one, that as property pays the tax, therefore, the tax payers should receive the corresponding benefit of such tax; then, the present distribution militates with this principle, in that regard, and the argument, if good in the one case should be good in the other and apply there also. But this principle which Taxation calls for will be considered again in its proper place. It is merely used here as an argument.

There is no reason founded in justice or equity, for this discrimination. We have but one government in South Carolina; and every citizen stands in the same relative position to this government. All stand alike no matter wherefrom, whether from Lancaster, Kershaw, or any where else. All are alike, citizens of the State, no matter what their geographical position may be. They are all constituents of the same body politic. The subject of Free Schools is mainly one of State policy. The State is benefited in the education of the people; and the people, in turn, are benefited to that extent.

But it may be said, that as the Parishes and Districts pay the Taxes, and receive the benefit of the distribution of the Fund, that therefore the present mode of distribution is just and equitable.

Here, the whole difficulty arises, viz: in considering the Free School System as a mere District and Parish institution, and not strictly a State institution. If the State were

a Federal Head, consisting of separate sovereignties and Independencies. If the Districts and Parishes stood to the State, in the same relation as the States to the Federal government, then, there might be some justice and propriety in the principle. But the State of South Carolina is a government integral, and consolidated in its character. The State is bounded by North Carolina, Georgia and the Atlantic Ocean. It is alone divided into Parishes, and Districts, for Representative, judicial and other purposes, and for conveniences generally. But the State as such, is one government—it is a whole. The State entrusts to, and imposes upon the Districts and Parishes, the management of many things within their limits, such as the roads, bridges, the Poor, and other matters of less importance; because these can more conveniently be attended to by the Districts, and, at the same time, the State is relieved of so much extra government; but the education of the people, like the Judiciary is of higher importance and becomes, peculiarly, the subject of State protection and State regard.

In the consideration of the mode of distribution, we are not to look at the means by which the fund is raised—we are not to look to the source from which it comes—we must not settle this question by the principle: that as wealth pays the tax, therefore, it is just and equitable, that wealth should receive its benefits. That is entirely a different matter, and does not apply here. To raise and collect taxes, is one thing; and to appropriate money from the Treasury another. Taxes are raised, to meet the wants and necessities of the State; and when collected, they become the property of the State, and the subject of State control; they go into public Treasury, to be again expended for any legitimate purpose. A man who pays fifty dollars in taxes to the State, after he has made the payment to the Tax collector, has no more claim upon it, than any other citizen of the State; no more, than the man who has paid but one dollar. He has paid the fifty dollars as a tax upon his property, and this Tax is but the price for its defence. The man, who pays fifty dollars as a tax, has more property at stake, his property is protected, in amount, larger than the man, who pays but one dollar, and hence, his greater Tax. He has paid, and done no more, than the just principles of Government require of him. If the more wealthy furnish the means, the hardy yeomanry of the country stand ready to protect them in the enjoyment of their property, and to sustain and defend the State.

When the State requires a military force, and a call is made to arms, the levies are not then made, according to the pecuniary interests, or ability of the Districts, and Parishes, not according to membership in the House—no, a different rule then obtains—all stand alike, and bear the same relation to the State; and every District and Parish must furnish its respective quota of men, according to its strength—according to its white population, the subjects of military duty. If this principle be acknowledged in war, let it then be observed, and carried out in peace, and let the good as well as the ill, be shared equally. "It is a bad rule which does not work both ways."

But let us attempt to carry out the principle, that as wealth pays the taxes, therefore, the distribution is just, and where do we end? In the first place we stop short, because the individuals who pay the Taxes, cannot possibly receive back benefits in proportion to what they pay. A man may pay a large Tax, and from the circumstance of his living in a District, or Parish, where Taxation contributes but little to membership, he will not receive a corresponding benefit, through the distributive share of his District. There can be no rule to reach his case, and to enable him to receive back in proportion to what he pays. And in the next place, if we attempt to carry it out, in the case of the Parishes and District, the consequence will be, that those Districts and Parishes, which pay the largest Taxes, should have all their public buildings, Court Houses, Jails, &c., upon a scale more grand and in a style, more costly, should receive more of the services of the Governor, of the Judges, and of every other public officer, or State salaried functionary; in a word, should receive back in some way or other the additional sum which they pay, over and above the other Districts and Parishes in the State. This principle would be scarcely tolerated in South Carolina; yet it is, in effect the same, as the one involved in the present mode of distribution of the Free School Fund.

Apart from all considerations of justice, equality, and wise State Policy, the Free School System is in its practical operation a beneficiary institution, and as such, it merits a more liberal policy, and a more extended philanthropy. To sum up the argument, the present system is defective in its organization, inasmuch as the distribution of the Fund is contrary to the object, and true purposes of the institution; and on that account, opposed to a wise State Policy. It is partial in its benefits to the beneficiaries, and to the Tax paying, and other citizens of the State, and, therefore, unjust and unequal. It operates as a mere District or Parish institution, and is sectional in its benefits; and, therefore, it becomes altogether unjust, unequal, and unwise.

We will continue the subject next week. "McCOTTRY."

(For the Ledger.)

John Belton O'Neal.

Mr. Editor:—Since the establishment of the Lancaster of a press of "our own," we have perused its columns with an interest unfeigned in the pursuit of any other paper; and in justice to yourself we confess that this interest has been attended with no small degree of gratification and pride. We must, however, take the liberty to say, that we noticed with regret, and read with pain and mortification,

the article in the Ledger of last week, copied from the South Carolinian, and headed "Bitter Words," which in our humble opinion reflects with unmerited severity upon one of Carolina's most valuable citizens and most faithful public servants.

It is not by any means our purpose, Mr. Editor, to attempt a defense of the truly "great and good man," to whom that article alludes; for, sir, well aware we are that the name of John Belton O'Neal is of itself a bulwark impregnable to the attacks of any foe, and amply sufficient to afford protection under any and every assault. In penning these lines, therefore, we simply act in obedience to that better part of our nature, to whose influence we trust we shall never be insensible, and which prompts us, at all times, and under all circumstances, to "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's."

We think that the remarks of the Carolinian are calculated to create erroneous impressions in the minds of some of your readers who may not have seen Judge O'Neal's letter in the Temperance Advocate of April 1st. It is evident even from the extract which elicited the strictures alluded to, that the Judge had been violently assailed through the columns of the Winnsboro Register by two several correspondents, because he had thought proper to defend Mr. White (of whom we have not a word to say) from charges which he at least, believed to be false and unfounded. It is further apparent, that the expression, "Fanatic of Temperance and submissiveness in politics" did not originate with his Honor, but were the epithets uncourtously used by these correspondents towards him. If the Judge's remarks in reference to these assaults do favor some, what of severity, we would respectfully ask, if no allowance can be made for the expressions of a sensitive and noble spirit, conscious of the purity of its motives, and the disinterested benevolence of its intentions, when chafed, galled and wounded by the wanton and ungenerous assaults of those for whose benefit it has devoted a large life of unparalleled toil and incessant labor!

We will trespass no longer upon the patience of yourself and readers than simply to add, that whether Judge O'Neal be destined to live long or die soon, he has already erected for himself, in the hearts of the good and virtuous, a monument of glory more enduring than the pyramids of Egypt, upon which the Christian and Philanthropist, for ages to come, may feast their admiring vision, while it shall teach a lesson of terror and dismay to sin and folly, vice and immorality, so long as time shall last!

From the above, you and your readers, Mr. Editor, may be able to form some idea of the opinion of, and the feelings towards John Belton O'Neal, which pervade the breast of at least one, who you will admit possesses a shadow of claim to the title of a "rabid SECESSIONIST."

## Lancaster Ledger.

Lancasterville, S. C.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1852.

The Spring Term of the Court of Common Pleas commenced its session here on Monday last, Judge Frost presiding. It is unknown to us if they are any cases of material importance, we believe not. True bills were found in a number of State cases. Several of these cases reflect but little credit on our District: assault and battery, rape, selling liquor without licence, &c.

The business of the Court, we presume, will occupy it the remainder of the week.

### The Credit System.

We received an anonymous communication some time since, in which the writer in advertising to the Homestead Exemption, remarked, that if the credit system were abandoned, there would be no use to exempt any property from levy and sale. No one is in favor of the Cash System more than we are, and could it be adopted, it would tend greatly to decrease the amount of our national expenditures, but it is perfectly useless to recommend a system which cannot be adopted. Man is a dependent being, and in all the relations of life each member of society is dependent on his brother. In fact, this dependence is the connecting link which unites man to man, and is the impulsive power which generates feelings of gratitude in the heart of man.

Individuals are made thus dependent upon each other, in order to render harmony, peace, and mutual assistance, their interest as well as their duty. Where men are mutually dependent upon each other, the prosperity of one is the prosperity of all; and the adversity of one is the adversity of all. No one can enjoy many of the blessings which God has intended for him, only in so far as others enjoy them also; and no one can be deprived of them, unless others are deprived of them to a considerable degree also. Thus, we see that the individual progress of man, is by the constitution of things indissolubly connected with, if not absolutely dependent on, his social progress."

The more numerous are exchanges, the better it is for every community, this is evident to every one who understands the first principles of Political Economy. Now we conceive that if a law were enacted restricting credit, that the exchanges of such community would necessarily be decreased. In the city of New York or Charleston, it does not appear that the credit system is so much adopted as here in Lancaster, or in any part of our upper country, yet it is equally extensive only in a different form. A Dry Goods Merchant discounts a Note in the Bank for One Hundred or Five Hundred Dollars, borrows this money and gives his note with proper security payable at the expiration of sixty or ninety days as the case may be.

By this means he is enabled to pay cash for his Groceries and other necessities, confident that he will be enabled to pay his note when due, from the proceeds derived

from the sale of his dry goods. This is a wholesale credit system, he borrows his friends' endorsement, and then borrows from the Bank. Whether this be the best mode we cannot say—it may be from the fact, that the purchaser finds by close calculation, that the amount saved from paying Cash, far exceeds the interest he pays to the Bank for the loan of the money.

There are one or two reasons why this plan could not be adopted in our up country. In the first place Banks are not convenient to us, and in the next place most of our community are farmers, they should not borrow money from the Bank.

This is the reason why they should not. It is impossible for a farmer to promise he can meet the payment of a note, which runs but sixty or ninety days, when he is unable to say if his crop will bring him sufficient to meet the payment, and he could only borrow if the sixty or ninety days, preceding the period when the note would become due. He may have his note renewed. So he may, but it is not always such an arrangement can be effected, and when pressing necessity comes, he will be obliged perhaps to sacrifice property to pay his note. A farmer has no business to meddle with Banks, his business does not require much financial knowledge, and as it is an avocation calculated to be freer from the troubles and turmoils of life more than any other, it should be the aim of the farmer to try and make it so. So soon as he gets in inveterate financiering and money speculations, he loses a relish for that which he intended to devote his time and attention to. In our Stores, a man who is known to have the property to pay his debts, can obtain goods on one year's credit, or at least he is expected to settle the first of every January. If his crop have failed to bring him in a sufficient sum which would enable him to pay these debts, he gives a promissory note paying interest from the first of the year, and frequently it is three or four years before he finally pays up in full, but he is known to be good for the amount and is not perplexed and troubled as he would be with a Bank note.

From these facts we think the credit system will always be adopted, and we do certainly think it better by far for the farmer to become indebted to the merchants of his District than the Banks of the State.

### Palmetto Sentinel, Blackville S. C.

Our unknown brother, the editor of the Sentinel replies to our notice of his paper, and more particularly to that portion in which we say as follows: "Somewhere or other we cannot understand this supporting Southern Institutions, and yet, go with the State for weal or woe. Suppose South Carolina renounced slavery, how then? The Sentinel apprehends no danger on the part of the State departing from the principle it has ever believed to be to her interest, and concurring with other States opposed to slavery, and says:

"As we apprehend no danger on the part of the State, we expressed no fears. We hardly think even now, that we shall ever be called upon to follow a State, whose efforts have, at all times, been zealously and magnanimously put forth, to build up, foster and defend the rights of the State and institutions of the South, into that strange substitution of policy to tear down and demolish that which she has with steady and fixed purpose aimed to establish and perpetuate."

This is all right enough, but we will give our unknown brother our reason for propounding the inquiry. Every paper that is started now a days in the Southern Country, takes slavery as the hobby to ride on into popular favor and not unfrequently the editors who may be Northern men, take this as their strong fort. They declare war against the free S. S. S. and profess to be enthusiastic admirers and advocates of this system. This is the great hobby, but still there is another, though less in magnitude well calculated to excite and promote their interests—this is to go for the State for weal or woe—right or wrong to go for the State. Now we would consider our self deficient of all patriotism to advocate or even sanction all the State would do. If I am a secessionist, and the State decides on remaining in the Union, must I profess to be satisfied that the State is right, when in heart my desire is to see her leave the Union?

### Col. J. Chesnut, Jr.

This gentleman has been nominated in the Columbia State Rights Republican, by one of its correspondents, as the successor of the Hon. J. A. Woodward, in the U. S. Congress. Col. Chesnut is well known to our readers to be, not only an accomplished gentleman, but also an able and distinguished politician. Fairchild Herald.

We know of no gentleman in either District, comprising this, the third Congressional District, more able, or better calculated to represent us in Congress than Col. Chesnut.

His well known ability, added to his affable and courteous manners, renders him one our people love to honor, and certainly no better, or more judicious selection could have been made.

### Cotton Gins.

We invite attention to the advertisement of Mr. McCright, of Camden, in this paper. Being personally acquainted with Mr. McC., we can vouch for what he says. We assure our readers he can furnish us with as good Gins as can be procured anywhere.

Messrs. Cureton & Massey have several slips of advertisements, in this paper—though short they give much information: Bacon, Iron, Flour and every thing in the Grocery line they have for sale.

held by our friend, and at the same time for the purpose of doing Mr. Arthur what service we can, we give it a place in our paper:

CAMDEN, April 9, 1852.

R. S. BAILY, Esq.—Dear Sir: In your last paper I see you want some numbers of Arthurs Home Gazette. I take pleasure in supplying you with those you wish, and the two numbers received since. In this package you will receive numbers 28, 29, 30 and 31.

I am glad you like that paper so much, it is, in my estimation, one of very best family newspapers in the United States, so valuable do I consider it that I take two copies, one to file, and one to give any friend who may desire it, or to whom I may recommend it and wish to furnish with a specimen. If my influence could have that effect, every house keeper in America, who is able to pay for it, and can read it or have it read, would be a subscriber. Mr. Arthurs teachings have such a tendency to smooth down, soften, and purify the roughness and unevenness of our natures, that if any honest man, will tell me, after reading it carefully one year, that he is not wiser, better, and more virtuous, I will agree to refund the subscription money, and in sorrow sink him down in my mind as a case most hopeless of improvement.

I have taken the paper from its commencement, and have the file complete, which I prize highly. Its circulation now, is over eighteen thousand copies.

Hoping that your Ledger may prove a benefit to the people of my native District. I remain, yours respectfully,

J. R.

On Saturday, which is generally an idle day with us, we paid a visit to the store of Messrs. Billings and Bell. These gentlemen have a perfect museum opposite the Court House, having almost everything, man, woman or child might need. Dry Goods, Hardware, Groceries, Saddlery, &c. See their advertisements.

### South Carolina Papers.

We design to give a brief notice of the different papers in our State, showing in as brief a manner as possible, the leading characteristics of each paper.

THE CHARLESTON COURIER.—This paper is published in Charleston, by A. S. Willington & Co. Daily \$10 per year; tri-weekly \$5 per year. Col. King, assisted occasionally by Mr. Yeaton, and constantly by Mr. Alexander, Carroll, formerly of the Palmetto State Banner, superintended the editorial department. Since Mr. King's death, we presume Messrs. Yeaton and Carroll control the paper. The Courier is about the best commercial paper in the State. It is a neutral paper, fearful at all times of rendering itself unpopular; and has always had the largest subscription list of any paper in the State.

THE MERCURY.—This paper is also published in Charleston. Daily \$10 per year; tri-weekly \$5 per year. Messrs. Hart and Taber are the editors and proprietors. The Mercury is an enthusiastic advocate for Secession, and has contributed no little to ferment the blood in the veins of the members of the Secession party. Still we admire the Mercury, and have always admired it for the independent stand it has ever taken. No bribery can make it swerve from the course it has once taken. The Mercury is also the organ of the Democratic party.

THE SOUTHERN STANDARD.—B. C. Pressley, Editor, assisted by Dr. Skrine. Daily \$6 per year; tri-weekly \$3, and weekly \$2 per year. This paper likewise is published in Charleston. During the excitement last Spring, this paper was established to advance the interests of the Co-operation party, and consequently is still devoted to their interests. The Standard is one of the standard papers of the State. Mr. Pressley and assistant are not as lazy as some of our upper country brethren, but every copy we receive, bears upon its face the truth of their untiring exertions to make the Standard interesting and instructive.

EVENING NEWS.—W. V. Paxon, Proprietor. Daily \$8 per year; tri-weekly \$4, and weekly \$2 per year. This paper is published in Charleston, and edited, we believe, by J. N. Cardozo, Esq. The News is a Co-operation sheet; and from the editorials which appear in every number, we judge the intellectual capacities of its worthy editor are as brilliant as they were in his more youthful days. There is more good logical reasoning in this paper than any paper in the State.

TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE, Charleston.—Edwin Herriot, Editor and Proprietor; published weekly at \$2 per year. This paper is devoted to the interests of the Temperance cause, but also contains articles on Agriculture, Literature, &c. Mr. Bowman, of the State Banner, formerly edited this paper; but it has suffered no detriment under the supervision of Mr. Herriot.

SOUTH CAROLINIAN, Columbia.—This paper is published daily at \$6 per year; tri-weekly at \$3, and weekly at \$2. Johnson & Davis, Publishers and Proprietors.—W. B. Johnson, Editor.

The Carolinian is death on Co-operation, and energetically, enthusiastically, and fanatical, in favor of Separate Secession. The Carolinian is a good news paper, in the strict literal sense of the word; for in its columns will always be found scraps of news which will interest every one. Mr. Johnson formerly edited the Camden Journal. He is a good, graceful writer, very particular in regard to the orthography and etymology of his editorials, that in almost every case they would be fit to be published in the Southern Quarterly.

PALMETTO STATE BANNER, Columbia.—J. C. Morgan, Publisher and Proprietor. Jno. G. Bowman, Editor. This paper is published weekly at \$3 per year.

Mr. Bowman is a good writer, his editorials read well, and characterize the author to be a free, easy writer. We like this

Some man said he never rubbed out a word after he had written it; and that is just about the way we do. Mr. Bowman also seems to write ahead, and his editorials display much thought and practical reasoning.

The Banner formerly advocated the doctrine of the Secession party; but Mr. Morgan, finding that party in the minority, sold the political interest of the Banner to the Co-operation party. It is now a strong Co-operation sheet.

THE STATES RIGHTS REPUBLICAN is a kind of auxiliary to the Banner. This is published daily at \$5 per year, and tri-weekly at \$3 per year.

THE FAMILY FRIEND, Columbia.—S. A. Godman and J. J. Lyons Proprietors.—S. A. Godman Editor. The Friend is a strictly Literary paper, and published weekly at \$2 per year. There is no literary paper South of the Potomac River, which, as a literary paper, gives the subscriber the full worth of his money more than this does.

JOURNAL, Camden.—T. J. Warren, Editor and Proprietor. This paper is published Semi-Weekly at \$3 50 per year, and Weekly at \$2. The Journal is a Secession sheet, though for some months past, relaxing in severity towards the other party. It is so quite a strenuous advocate of the Homestead Law.

The editor exercises good taste in his selections, and his editorials evince considerable ability. His paper deserves the patronage of the citizens of Kershaw District, more particularly so, if his efforts were engaged to put down the Homestead Law instead of advocating it.

This list will be resumed until all of our exchanges have received the benefit of our criticisms.

## EDITOR'S TABLE.

SENT OF THE SOUTH, Columbia, Ga.

This valuable agricultural paper we have received for April—the March number never reached us. As usual it is well filled with valuable original articles on agriculture. Published monthly at \$100 per year.

When we first started our paper, we sent one to the Agriculturist, Augusta Ga., and the publishers of that journal very promptly sent us their February number; in it they requested us to notice their paper which we did, and although unsolicited, published their prospectus. Since then we have not received the Agriculturist. We have heard of Northern Publishers being guilty of such conduct, but never before in a Southern State have we known of a similar instance.

MR. DORN'S GOLD-MINE.—We take the following from the last Edgefield Advertiser:

The yield of Mr. Dorn's gold mine is exciting, as it should, some interest in the midst of our citizens. True, the credibility of an occasional reader is sorely tried by the reports of his enormous profits. But such persons should remember that sometimes "truth is strange—stranger even than fiction." And although it may seem "passing strange" that such quantities of gold should be found in these old back woods of South Carolina, yet it is nevertheless indubitably substantiated, by more than two or three witnesses, that such is the fact. And the wish holding of the record of any one, he he ever so scientific, should do him no harm. The fact one will. The King of Siam swore that the traveller, who told him of ice was a liar, because he (the King) had never seen it. But this sort of ratiocination won't pass in this great age—no, no.

Below we give the sum and substance of an exact and true account of March.

Total produce, 26,167 pennyweights, making an average for each working day of about 1,006 pennyweights. This daily yield is worth nearly one thousand dollars, which is proved by the fact that 4,632 pennyweights, already carried to the mint by a responsible agent, has been sold for something over \$4,000. Pretty fair, we repeat, for 8 hands in South Carolina diggings!

One of the first waltzes we learned to make our flute discourse was called the "Silver Miner's Waltz." It is high time, we think the "Gold Miner's" should be composed. Where is friend Ogden of Laurens memory?

Since penning the foregoing remarks we learn that Mr. Dorn has had water in this place, by a skillful druggist, 100 pounds of gold dust. There's the old fashioned weight for you.

SHOCKING AFFAIR.—A negro boy belonging to Mr. Abram Lites, of this district, a few days since, murdered his wife by splitting her head open with an axe whilst she was asleep. The reason he assigns for so brutal an act is, that he lived unhappily with her, and jealousy prompted him to it. After committing the murder, he made no attempt to get out of the way, but informed his master of it, and of his own accord came on to the village and gave himself up to the jailor, after a full confession of the affair. He will be tried before J. G. Baskin, Esq. on Wednesday next.

This is one of the most cold blooded murders that ever occurred in our district, and argues on the part of the perpetrator a degree of madness bordering on insanity. —Abbeville Banner.

The Burlington Gazette states that a curious instance of the recovery of lost property occurred in that place last week. In 1829 a lady lost some silver spoons, and subsequently the family removed, but returned to their residence last winter. The gardener last week while digging in the garden turned up the spoons, which though black and corroded, were recognized to be the same.

WHO CAN BEAT IT?—An Ox, fattened by Mr. John Frantz, residing near Waynesboro' Franklin Co., Pa., and last week slaughtered by that well known butcher, Mr. Samuel Newman of this place, weighing 906 pounds, had a larger quantity of fat (we have the authority of butchers for saying so) than any other of the same weight that has ever been slaughtered. Rough-fat 192 lbs.—bones 130 lbs